

Remarks

Claims 1-3, 5-23 and 26-28 are pending. Claims 1, 8, 10, 11, 15, 23 and 28 have been amended. Support for claim amendments to claim 1 may be found throughout the specification, see for example, ¶'s 2-3, 6, 13, 15-16, 19, 28, 31, 34 and 42. Claims 8 and 10 were amended to correct for informalities. Support for claim amendments to claim 11 may be found throughout the specification, see for example, ¶'s 2-3, 6, 13, 15-16, 19, 28, 31, 34 and 42. Support for claim amendments to claim 15 may be found throughout the specification, see for example, ¶'s 2-3, 6, 13, 15-16, 19, 28, 31, 34 and 42. Support for claim amendments to claim 23 may be found throughout the specification, see for example, ¶'s 2-3, 6, 13, 15-16, 19, 28, 31, 34 and 42. Support for claim amendments to claim 28 may be found throughout the specification, see for example, ¶'s 2-3, 6, 13, 15-16, 19, 28, 31, 34 and 42. No new matter has been added. Applicants assert that all claims are in condition for allowance as set forth more fully below.

Interview Summary

The undersigned participated in an interview with Examiner Chankong on February 8, 2006. Differences were discussed between the pending claims and the cited prior arts. It was discussed that Applicant was unable to find any teaching within Profit of a server suite having access to both a web-server and a separate Internet or intranet because the figure only shows a single connection and Profit at Col. 6, l. 38-58 discusses a specific Internet/intranet connection. Examiner Chankong disagreed with Applicants interpretation and indicated that he would maintain the rejection. Applicant and Examiner Chankong then discussed a proposed amendment in which one or more claims would be amended such that the content on one or more of the legacy data or intranet data was not web-based content and that such a recitation was not taught in any of the cited prior art. Examiner Chankong indicated that such a recitation would likely overcome the current rejections.

103 Rejections

Claims 1, 6, 11 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Willis, Jr. et al. (US Pat. No. 6, 738,815) in view of Profit, Jr. et al. (US Pat. No. 6,636,831).

Claims 2, 3, 7, 14, 15-17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Willis, Jr. and Profit and further in view of Stone et al. (US Pat. No. 6,101,510).

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Willis in view of Butts et al. (US Pat. No. 6,233,541).

Claims 8, 9, and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Willis in view of Devine.

Claims 18 and 20-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Willis and Stone in view of Devine et al., (US Pat. No. 6,598,167).

Claims 23 and 26-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Profit in view of Stone, in further view of Fortier, Jr. et al, (US Pat. Publ. No. 2003-0023601).

Claim 28 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Device, Profit and Stone and further in view of Fortier.

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

The Office Action Summary indicates that claim 10 has also been rejected. However, the Detailed Action apparently omits any discussion concerning the grounds for rejecting claim 10. As such, applicants are unable to address the Examiner's grounds for rejecting claim 10, if any, and assert that claim 10 contains allowable subject matter.

Claims 1-3 and 5-10

Currently amended independent claim 1 includes a recitation wherein at least one of the data at the intranet and the data at the legacy system is non web based both at the respective intranet or legacy system and when being communicated to the user. The cited prior art, on the other hand, discusses the middleware doing conversion of legacy data to web based so that the sever suite provides the web content such that there is no disclosure

of the above recitations nor would one of ordinary skill in the art find motivation to combine the cited prior art with another reference.

Thus, and as noted above in the interview summary, Applicants respectfully submit that such a recitation is neither disclosed nor suggested by any of the cited prior art references individually or in combination and that claim 1 is therefore allowable over the cited prior art for at least these reasons.

Dependant claims 2-3 and 5-10 depend from an allowable claim 1 and are also allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claims 11-14

Currently amended independent claim 11 includes a recitation wherein at least some of the data on the legacy system and some of the data on the intranet is non web-based both at the respective intranet or legacy system and when being communicated to the user. The cited prior art, on the other hand, discusses the middleware doing conversion of legacy data to web based so that the sever suite provides the web content such that there is no disclosure of the above recitations nor would one of ordinary skill in the art find motivation to combine the cited prior art with another reference.

Thus, and as noted above in the interview summary, Applicants respectfully submit that such a recitation is neither disclosed nor suggested by any of the cited prior art references individually or in combination and that claim 11 is therefore allowable over the cited prior art for at least these reasons.

Dependant claims 12-14 depend from an allowable claim 11 and are also allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claims 15-22

Currently amended independent claim 15 includes a recitation wherein at least some of the data on the legacy system and some of the data on the intranet is non web-based both at the respective intranet or legacy system and when being communicated to the user. The cited prior art, on the other hand, discusses the middleware doing conversion of legacy data to web based so that the sever suite provides the web content

such that there is no disclosure of the above recitations nor would one of ordinary skill in the art find motivation to combine the cited prior art with another reference.

Thus, and as noted above in the interview summary, Applicants respectfully submit that such a recitation is neither disclosed nor suggested by any of the cited prior art references individually or in combination and that claim 15 is therefore allowable over the cited prior art for at least these reasons.

Dependant claims 16-22 depend from an allowable claim 15 and are also allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claims 23 and 26-27

Currently amended independent claim 23 includes a recitation wherein at least some of the data on the legacy system or some of the data on the intranet is non web-based both at the respective intranet or legacy system and when being communicated to the user. The cited prior art, on the other hand, discusses the middleware doing conversion of legacy data to web based so that the sever suite provides the web content such that there is no disclosure of the above recitations nor would one of ordinary skill in the art find motivation to combine the cited prior art with another reference.

Thus, and as noted above in the interview summary, Applicants respectfully submit that such a recitation is neither disclosed nor suggested by any of the cited prior art references individually or in combination and that claim 23 is therefore allowable over the cited prior art for at least these reasons.

Dependant claims 26-27 depend from an allowable claim 23 and are also allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 28

Currently amended independent claim 23 includes a recitation wherein at least one of the data at the intranet and the data at the legacy system is non web based both at the respective intranet or legacy system and when being communicated to the user. The cited prior art, on the other hand, discusses the middleware doing conversion of legacy data to web based so that the sever suite provides the web content such that there is no disclosure

of the above recitations nor would one of ordinary skill in the art find motivation to combine the cited prior art with another reference.

Thus, and as noted above in the interview summary, Applicants respectfully submit that such a recitation is neither disclosed nor suggested by any of the cited prior art references individually or in combination and that claim 28 is therefore allowable over the cited prior art for at least these reasons.

Conclusion

Applicants assert that the application including claims 1-3, 5-23, and 26-28 is now in condition for allowance. Applicants request reconsideration in view of the amendments and remarks above and further request that a Notice of Allowability be provided. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact the undersigned.

No fees are believed due beyond the fees due for the fee for continued examination. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 28, 2006

Withers & Keys, LLC
P.O. Box 71355
Marietta, Ga 30007-1355
(404) 849.2093



Michael J. Bootcheck
Reg. No. 52,636